UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,628	12/16/2003	Roger M. Scott	07948-0035	2664

22852 7590 06/28/2006

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER	
VO, THANH DUC	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2189	

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/735,628	SCOTT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thanh D. Vo	2189	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 April 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-31* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *27 April 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Amendment filed on April 27, 2006. Claims 1 and 16 have been amended. Claims 1-31 are presented for examination. Claims 1-53 are pending. All objects and rejections not repeated below are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 6, 10, 16-18, 19, 21, 25 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor (US Patent 5,530,232) in view of Rawat et al. (US Patent 6,662,340).

As to claims 1 and 16, Taylor disclosed a method for communicating data from a plurality of data sources to a plurality of data targets in a data processing system having a plurality of connection mechanisms for establishing logical connections between data sources and data targets, the method comprising:

selecting one of a plurality of applications associated with a first data source (col. 4, lines 44-47), wherein each of the plurality of data source applications has a plurality of data elements (col. 4, lines 49-56);

mapping/linking a data element from the first data source to a data entry field using a drag-and-drop operation (col. 5, lines 25-46); and

automatically associating a data element on a second data source corresponding to the mapped data element with the data entry field of the selected data target application (col. 5, line 25 – col. 6, line 36).

In addition to the indicated lines and columns from the reference above, the step of drag-and-drop or making it automatic is insignificant since making an operation manual or automatic is unpatentable.

Furthermore, the step of associating the data element from the source to the target is an inherent feature in this field of invention since it is required by the system to correctly map the data and associate them accordingly to avoid any errors arises from mismatching the corresponded entries.

Taylor did not explicitly disclose a method of:

displaying to the user a plurality of applications associated with the data target, wherein each of the plurality of the data target applications has a plurality of data entry fields; and

selecting one of the plurality of applications associated with the data target based on a second input from the user.

However, Rawat et al. discloses a method of:

displaying to the user a plurality of applications associated with the data target, wherein each of the plurality of the data target applications has a plurality of data entry fields (See Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 28-36); and

selecting one of the plurality of applications associated with the data target based on a second input from the user. See col. 4, line 63 – col. 5, line 1.

It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to combine the method of Taylor with the method of Rawat et al. since it is advantageous to provide an intelligent, fully automated form filler that maps the fields of an electronic form by parsing visual page elements, such as the user-visible field labels as taught by Rawet et al. at col. 3, lines 47-50.

As to claims 2 and 17, Taylor disclosed a method further comprising copying a value stored in a data entry field to a data element associated with the second data source, provided the value stored in the data entry field has been mapped to the data element. See col. 5, line 25 – col. 6, line 36.

As to claims 3 and 18, Taylor disclosed a method, wherein mapping further comprises mapping a data element to a plurality of data entry fields, wherein the data element from the second data source is automatically associated with the plurality of data entry fields of the selected data target application. See col. 4, line 57 – col. 5, line 24, col. 5, lines 25-46, and col. 6.

As to claims 4 and 19, Taylor disclosed a method, wherein mapping further comprises the step of reading data from the first data source, transforms the data, and writes to the selected data target application has been performed. See col. 4, line 44 – col. 5, line 54.

Further review indicates that a **script** is a software program that was previously programmed with the function of reading the data from the data source.

Noted that Taylor disclosed a method of reading the data from the data source. See col. 4, line 44 – col. 5, line 54.

Therefore, Taylor is inherently containing a program code (a script) in order to perform an equivalent task in the claim invention.

As to claims 5 and 20, although Taylor did not explicitly disclose a step of writing the transformed data to an output file when a previous mapping from the first data source to the selected data target application has not been performed.

However, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art to realize that the said step is a well-known method in the computer art and data communication since the updated data should be saved to an output file during the execution period or before the system is terminated in order to keep the newly updated data consistent with the information that was supposed to be updated. Therefore, it is obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant invention to realize that writing data to an output file is well known and unpatentable.

As to claims 6 and 21, Taylor disclosed a method, wherein the first data source is a smart card. See col. 3, lines 47-66.

As to claims 7 and 22, although Taylor did not explicitly disclose the data target is a Microsoft Windows ™ -based application. However, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include the data target to be a Microsoft Windows TM – based application since Microsoft Windows ™ Operation System is a well-known OS and being used widely over the world.

As to claims 8 and 23, although Taylor did not explicitly disclose the step of mapping further comprises storing data elements of the second data source in an output file when a previous mapping from the first data source to the selected data target application has not been performed.

However, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the applicant's invention to realize that said step is a well-known method in the computer art and data communication method since the updated data should be saved to an output file during the execution period or before the system is terminated in order to keep the newly updated data consistent with the information that was supposed to be updated. Therefore, it is obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant invention to realize that writing data to an output file is well known and unpatentable.

As to claims 9 and 23, Taylor disclosed the step of storing data elements of the second data source in an output file which is a well-known method in the computer art and data communication method since the updated data should be saved to an output file during the execution period or before the system is terminated in order to keep the newly updated data consistent with the information that was supposed to be updated.

Therefore, it is obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant invention to realize that writing data to an output file is well known and unpatentable.

As to claims 10, 25, and 31, Taylor disclosed a method for communicating data from a plurality of data sources to a plurality of data targets in a data processing system having a plurality of connection mechanisms for establishing logical connections between data sources and data targets, the method comprising:

reading data from a data source (col. 4, lines 14-19);

if the read data has been mapped to a data entry field associated with a data target application using a drag-and-drop operation, associating the read data with the data entry field (col. 5, lines 25-46); and

Taylor did not particularly teach a method of storing the data in an output file if it has not mapped to a data entry field associated with a data target application.

Rawat et al. teaches a method of storing the user profile on a server and retrieved by the client. See page 5, lines 50-51, wherein the user profile is the data file containing the data entry associated with the target application of the client. Since the

data entry is stored on the server side therefore it is considered as an output file to be used by the client.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to realize that if the read data has not been mapped to a data entry field associated with a data target application then store the read data in an output file. The advantage of storing the data to an output file at the server side if the data has not been mapped to its target application is to readily or automatically provided to the client/target application the data from the server once it is requested by the target application as disclosed by Rawat et al. on col. 2, lines 47-50.

As to claims 11 and 26, Taylor disclosed a method, wherein associating further comprises associating the read data with a plurality-of data entry fields corresponding to the data target application. See col. 5, line 25 – col. 6, line 36.

As to claims 12 and 27, Taylor disclosed method, wherein the data source is a smart card. See col. 3, lines 47-66.

As to claims 13, 14, 28, and 29, the output file is a text file (claims 13 and 28) or hypertext markup language file (claims 14 and 29) are well-known and useful file formats in computer art at the time of the applicant's invention since either file can easily change their extensions to .html or backward to .txt while avoiding any accidental lost of data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the method of claims 13, 14, 28, and 29 into the system of Taylor to arrive at the invention of claims 13, 14, 28, and 29, respectively.

As to claims 15 and 30, although Taylor did not explicitly disclosed the data target is a Microsoft Windows ™ -based application. However, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include the data target to be a Microsoft Windows TM – based application since Microsoft Windows ™ Operation System is a well-known OS and being used widely over the world.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

4. With respect to arguments to claims 10, 25, and 31:

Applicants request the Examiner to provide documentary evidence to support the obviousness rejection of claims 10, 25, and 31. This has been done; please refer to claim rejections above.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh D. Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-0708. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Reginald G. Bragdon can be reached on (571) 272-4204. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Thanh D. Vo
Patent Examiner
AU 2189
6/24/2006

Reginald G. Bragdon
REGINALD G. BRAGDON
PRIMARY EXAMINER